

**DRAFT FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT (FNSI)
WASHINGTON ARMY NATIONAL GUARD
INTEGRATED NATURAL RESOURCES MANAGEMENT PLAN
CAMP MURRAY, WASHINGTON**

Introduction

The Washington Army National Guard (WAARNG) prepared an Environmental Assessment (EA) to identify and evaluate potential adverse environmental effects associated with the implementation of WAARNG's Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan (INRMP). This INRMP is the first INRMP that has been developed for Camp Murray lands occupied and used by the WAARNG and the Emergency Management Division (EMD). This INRMP has been developed for use by the WAARNG under the auspices of the National Guard Bureau (NGB) as a tool for managing natural resources at the approximately 200-acre Camp Murray land occupied/used by the WAARNG and EMD. This INRMP has been developed in cooperation with the Camp Murray staff, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) and Washington Department of Natural Resources (WDNR) as well as various other regional government, nongovernment and private agencies. This INRMP is specific to planned WAARNG and EMD activities at Camp Murray. This EA has been prepared pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA), as amended (42 USC §4321); Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations (40 CFR Parts 1500-1508); National Guard Bureau NEPA Handbook, June 2006.

The purpose and need of the proposed action, implementation of the INRMP, is to provide for the effective, long-term management of the site's natural resources, while allowing the training mission to proceed. The INRMP is prepared to ensure that natural resource conservation measures and military activities on Camp Murray are integrated and consistent with Federal stewardship requirements. This INRMP is an Army policy INRMP pursuant to the U.S. Army policy dated 21 Mar 97 entitled *Army Goals and Implementing Guidance for Natural Resources Planning Level Survey (PLS) and INRMP* ("Army INRMP Policy") and is intended to be consistent with the Sikes Act Improvement Act (16 U.S. Code [USC] §670 *et seq.*). Additionally, the proposed action is needed to fulfill the requirements of Army Regulation (AR) 200-1, *Environmental Protection and Enhancement*; 32 CFR 651; Department of Defense (DoD) Directive 4700.1, *Natural Resources Management Programs*; and Department of Defense Instruction (DoDI) 4715.3, *Environmental Conservation Program*.

1. Description of the Proposed Action and Alternatives

Proposed Action. The Proposed Action consists of implementing natural resources management measures as presented in the INRMP. The INRMP includes goals for future natural resources management at Camp Murray. These goals are supported by objectives and projects, which provide management strategies and specific actions to achieve these goals. The main reasons for this INRMP are (1) to support and accommodate accomplishment of the military and emergency response missions while providing for natural resources stewardship and management.; and (2) to implement the Camp Murray Forest Management Plan (FMP) recommendations, which would ensure installation compliance with all applicable laws and regulations, perpetuation of natural resources needed to sustain the military mission, and safety of life and property for people using the installation.

Alternatives Considered. In addition to the Proposed Action, the WAARNG analyzed a No Action Alternative. The No Action Alternative is used as a baseline against which the action alternative may be compared. Adoption of the No Action Alternative would mean that the INRMP would not be implemented at Camp Murray and existing natural resources management practices would continue. The No Action Alternative includes no change from current management direction or level of management intensity. Under the No Action Alternative, the WAARNG will not conduct the recommendations in the Camp Murray FMP or the associated natural resource management goals and objectives outlined in the INRMP.

2. Environmental Analysis

Generally, the potential environmental consequences associated with implementing the Proposed Action Alternative, would result in either a positive effect or no effect to the natural, cultural, and socioeconomic

environments. In addition, implementation of this plan would ensure the sustainability of WAARNG lands to support mission requirements and training activities. Overall, through its emphasis on natural resource avoidance, restoration and/or monitoring, WAARNG's implementation of the INRMP is anticipated to result in net positive effects by sustaining and enhancing existing on-site natural resources while allowing training to proceed, and has been determined to be the best, most appropriate, and most practicable alternative. None of the proposed projects, alone or in combination, will have adverse effects on the physical, biological, or human environments. Implementation of the No Action Alternative could be expected to result in a long-term negative impact, including the degradation of Camp Murray lands.

Mitigation. No mitigation measures are necessary to reduce adverse environmental impacts to less than significant levels. No separate mitigation measures are required for implementation of the INRMP at Camp Murray. The INRMP identifies environmental coordination requirements necessary to implement training activities and construction projects. Any mitigation needed at Camp Murray would be in association with and in support of training and construction projects and not the direct implementation of the INRMP. The INRMP's function is to provide guidance, so that permitting and mitigation requirements for mission support can be met.

3. Regulations

The Proposed Action will not violate NEPA, the CEQ Regulations, 32 CFR 651, or any other Federal, state, or local environmental regulations.

4. Commitment to Implementation

The NGB and WAARNG affirm their commitment to implement this EA in accordance with NEPA. Implementation is dependent on funding. The WAARNG and the NGB's Environmental Programs Division will ensure that adequate funds are requested in future years' budgets to achieve the goals and objectives set forth in this EA.

5. Public Review and Comment

The draft INRMP/EA/FMP was made available for public review and comment from 11 March 2009 to 15 April 2009. Documents were made available at the Lakewood Public Library, the Olympia Timberland Library, and the WMD's Construction and Facilities Management Office (CFMO), and a Public Notice was published in three newspapers (Seattle Times, The Olympian and The News Tribune). A total of 27 comments from 5 sources were received during the public comment period. Comments included management recommendations for vegetation communities including Oregon oak woodlands, classification and taxonomy of soils and vegetation, and minor grammatical corrections. Public comments received were addressed in the final draft reports. The draft FNSI will be made available for public review and comment following NGB approval from March 22, 2010 to April 22, 2010.

6. Draft Finding of No Significant Impact

After careful review of the EA, I have concluded that implementation of the Proposed Action would not generate significant controversy or have a significant impact on the quality of the human or natural environment. Per 32 CFR Part 651, the Final EA and draft FNSI was made available for a 30-day public review and comment period. Once public comments have been addressed and if a determination is made that the proposed action will have no significant impact, the FNSI will be signed and the action will be implemented. This analysis fulfills the requirements of NEPA and the CEQ Regulations. An Environmental Impact Statement will not be prepared, and the NGB will be issuing this FNSI.

Date

MICHAEL J. BENNETT
Colonel, US Army
Chief, Environmental
Programs Division